

FEB 23 2010

MOLLY C. DWYER, CLERK  
U.S. COURT OF APPEALS

NOT FOR PUBLICATION

UNITED STATES COURT OF APPEALS

FOR THE NINTH CIRCUIT

<p>LEONEL ARNOLDO MARTINEZ- SEGOVIA,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Petitioner,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">v.</p> <p>ERIC H. HOLDER Jr., Attorney General,</p> <p style="text-align: center;">Respondent.</p>
---

No. 08-73131

Agency No. A200-025-965

MEMORANDUM\*

On Petition for Review of an Order of the  
Board of Immigration Appeals

Submitted February 16, 2010\*\*

Before: FERNANDEZ, GOULD, and M. SMITH, Circuit Judges.

Leonel Arnolndo Martinez-Segovia, a native and citizen of El Salvador, petitions pro se for review of the Board of Immigration Appeals' ("BIA") order summarily affirming an immigration judge's decision denying his application for

---

\* This disposition is not appropriate for publication and is not precedent except as provided by 9th Cir. R. 36-3.

\*\* The panel unanimously concludes this case is suitable for decision without oral argument. *See* Fed. R. App. P. 34(a)(2).

asylum and withholding of removal. We have jurisdiction under 8 U.S.C. § 1252. We review de novo questions of law, *Cerezo v. Mukasey*, 512 F.3d 1163, 1166 (9th Cir. 2008), except to the extent that deference is owed to the BIA’s determination of the governing statutes and regulations, *Simeonov v. Ashcroft*, 371 F.3d 532, 535 (9th Cir. 2004), and we review factual findings for substantial evidence, *Zehatye v. Gonzales*, 453 F.3d 1182, 1184-85 (9th Cir. 2006). We deny the petition for review.

We reject Martinez-Segovia’s contention that he is eligible for asylum and withholding of removal based upon an anti-gang political opinion. *See Barrios v. Holder*, 581 F.3d 849, 856 (9th Cir. 2009); *see also Santos-Lemus v. Mukasey*, 542 F.3d 738, 746-47 (9th Cir. 2008) (denying relief where the “available evidence suggests . . . that Santos-Lemus was victimized for economic and personal reasons”). Accordingly, because Martinez-Segovia failed to demonstrate that he was persecuted or fears future persecution on account of a protected ground, we deny the petition as to his asylum and withholding of removal claims. *See Barrios*, 581 F.3d at 856.

Martinez-Segovia’s contention that the BIA’s streamlined order did not set forth adequate reasons for denying relief is foreclosed by *Falcon Carriche v.*

*Ashcroft*, 350 F.3d 845, 851 (9th Cir. 2003).

**PETITION FOR REVIEW DENIED.**